

## Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 11, and 13-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 19, and 29 are independent.

Claims 1-5, 11, and 13-29 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rangan, Feinleib, Courtney, Toyama, and Toklu, for the reasons noted at pages 2-14 of the Office Action. The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Xu for the detailed discussion of the art as applied to the claims (especially pages 2-3 of the Office Action). Such a thorough analysis is very helpful to Applicants and the public to refine the issues. Applicants respectfully traverse all art rejections.

The present claims require that the video linking system generates a linked video file that is separate from and not embedded in the video content. The linked video file comprises (i) a pixel object file and (ii) a separate data object file that includes information related to the object that corresponds to the selected pixel object. The data object file is linked to the corresponding pixel object file.

The Examiner contends that Ragan discloses the pixel object file that is separate from and not embedded in the video content. For purposes of this document, Applicants will not contest this assertion (see Fig. 4 of Ragan).

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Ragan fails to disclose a separate data object file, but contends that Feinleib teaches such structure. Feinleib indeed discloses overlay content which may be independently delivered to the customer premises. However, in Feinleib, such overlay content is not linked to the pixel object file, but instead is linked to the primary video content (closed caption script embedded in the Vertical Blanking Interval - "The enhancing content can be delivered independently of the primary content and synchronized at the viewer computing unit using the closed caption script which accompanies the primary content." Col. 9, lines 30-34). Therefore, Feinleib fails to disclose or suggest the claimed "data object file...linked to the corresponding pixel object file." In Feinleib, the overlay content is linked to the embedded closed caption script. Nor would the person of ordinary skill in the art think to combine Ragan and Feinleib to produce this feature. Feinleib will not work without linking the overlay content to the video content, which is precisely what the present invention seeks to avoid by ensuring that the pixel object file and the data object file are not embedded in the video content, and by linking the data object file with the pixel object file. If Ragan and Feinleib were combined, the pixel object file and the data object file would both be linked to the video content, and there would be no linking of the data

object file with the pixel object file. Accordingly, the important claimed features of the present invention are nowhere disclosed or suggested by the cited art.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that certain claimed features may be ignored as they are merely statements of "intended use." On the contrary, the claims specifically recite that the "video file is *configured* to be exportable to a media player." Therefore, the file must have sufficient structural features to work with a media player. These structural features are capable of analysis and determination. Any video file that is configured to play in a media player falls within this claim. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give full patentable weight to all claim elements.

Finally, Applicants note the Examiner's assertion that "motivation to combine references under 35 USC 103 does not have to be the same as that intended by the applicant nor does it have to solve the same problem applicant intends to solve in the art. The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, however, has held otherwise. The law is clear that the Examiner must make "findings as to the specific understanding or principle within the knowledge of a skilled artisan that would have motivated one with no knowledge of [the] invention to make the combination in

the manner claimed." In re Kotzab, 217 F. 3d 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3507. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard P. Bauer/  
Attorney for Applicants  
Richard P. Bauer  
Registration No. 31,588

PATENT ADMINISTRATOR  
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
2900 K Street NW / Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20007-5118  
Facsimile: (202) 298-7570